

REMARKS

Claims 25-48 remain pending in the present application.

In a September 19, 2006 Office Action, the Examiner objected to the drawings as requiring structural detail in the drawings. The applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's interpretation of MPEP 608.02(d). In particular, the structural elements are fully described in the specification and shown in the drawings as required by the MPEP section. However, the applicants submit herewith replacement drawings providing structural labels as requested by the Examiner to further the examination of the present application.

The Examiner also rejected claims 25-27, 29-31, 33, 39, 40, and 42-44 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by United States Patent 6,538,506 ("Hareyama"). The Examiner rejected claims 34, 35, and 46 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable and obvious over Hareyama in view of United States Patent 6,061,025 ("Jackson et al."). The Examiner rejected claims 36 and 48 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable and obvious over Hareyama in view of United States Patent 6,549,169 ("Matsuyoshi et al."). The Examiner rejected claims 32 and 45 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable and obvious over Hareyama in view of United States Patent 6,862,432 ("Kim"). The Examiner rejected claims 37, 38, and 47 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable and obvious over Hareyama in view of United States Published Patent Application publication number 2002/0057222 ("McKinzie, III et al."). Finally, the Examiner rejected claims 28 and 41 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable and obvious over Hareyama in view of United States Patent 6,571,087 ("Iwatsuki"). The applicants respectfully traverse the rejections for the reasons outlined below.

In particular, amended claim 25 recites a combination of elements including, for example, "controlling the radiating impedance of an antenna element loading said power amplifier in dependence of said desired load impedance, without use of a matching circuit between the power amplifier and the antenna element," which is not shown or disclosed by Hareyama. Rather, and at most, Hareyama discloses the "power amplifier is connected in series through the *matching circuit* 3 and a power detection coupler 17 for detecting present transmission power to the transmission antenna (transmission and reception) 4." (Hareyama at column 4, line 26-29 (emphasis added)). Thus, Hareyama discloses the matching circuit is used to control the

impedance loading the power amplifier. Whereas, claim 25 as previously presented and currently claimed discloses that the power amplifier load is the radiating impedance of the antenna element. Moreover, the radiating impedance is controlled in dependence of a desired load. Claim 25, however, has been amended to clarify that a matching circuit is not used. Because Hareyama specifically requires a matching network to control the impedance load on the power amplifier, and does not suggest, motivate, or teach using the radiating impedance of the antenna element, it does not and cannot anticipate claim 25. Thus, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 25 in view of Hareyama is respectfully requested.

Claims 30, 39, and 43 have been amended to contain limitations similar to amended claim 25 and, at least by virtue of the similarity are not anticipated by Hareyama. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 30, 39, and 43 is respectfully requested. Claims 26, 27, 29, 31, 33, 40, 42, and 44 depend directly or indirectly from claims 25, 30, 39, and 43 and, at least by virtue of the dependency, are not anticipated by Hareyama. Thus, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 26, 27, 29, 31, 33, 40, 42, and 44 is respectfully requested.

Claims 28, 32, 34-38, 41, and 45-48 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable and obvious over Hareyama in view of one or more of Jackson et al., Matsuyoshi et al., Kim, McKinzie, III et al., and Iwatsuki. The applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. In particular, claims 28- 32, 34-38, 41, and 45-48 depend directly or indirectly from claims 25, 30, 39, and 43. None of Jackson et al., Matsuyoshi et al., Kim, McKinzie, III et al., and Iwatsuki cure the defect of Hareyama mentioned above. Thus, for all the reasons outlined above, it is respectfully submitted that claims 28, 32, 34-38, 41, and 45-48 are patentably distinct from the references of record either alone or in any reasonable combination thereof.

For all the foregoing reasons, the applicant respectfully requests the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the pending rejections and allow claims 25-48. Allowance of the pending claims is respectfully requested.

If an extension of time under 35 C.F.R. § 1.136 is required to obtain entry of this Amendment, such an extension is requested. If there are fees due under 37 U.S.C. § 1.16 or 1.17 which are not otherwise accounted for, please charge our Deposit Account No. 08-2623.

Respectfully submitted,



Dated: March 19, 2007

Brian Kinnear
Registration No. 43,717
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT
HOLLAND & HART LLP
555 17th Street, Suite 3200
Post Office Box 8749
Denver, CO 80201-8749
Telephone: (303) 295-8170
Facsimile: (303) 295-8261

3684762_1.DOC